

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

February 17, 1999 LR 21

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, before I go on with the direction I intended to pursue, in touching on what Senator Coordsen had mentioned, we are men and women of the world. We understand things, we understand reality, and we understand appearance. If a city, county or other municipality issues revenue bonds, anybody who sees that kind of issuance is going to believe that it is being done by the city, or whatever political...or whatever entity we're talking about, in the same way that other revenue bonds are issued. Who is going to consider that the bonds will be secured by the pledge of a lease that, I suppose, might be or might not be in effect at the time the bonds are to be issued, revenue derived from this operation, but it's a charitable, nonprofit operation? So are we going to have to allow a larger amount of revenue than ordinarily be generated and let this operation be called nonprofit in order to retire these bonds, or taking a mortgage on the property? Those are the three ways that these bonds issued by the city, county, or other subdivision would be secured. It would be like me standing on this floor, and my word is good when I make a wager, Senator Redfield. I mean I might violate my word on anything else, which I have not done, but if I make a wager on this floor and I lose, I pay off. Others have made wagers and lost to me and not paid off, but I'm worried about my word, not theirs. People who are aware of that would never get the impression that if I said, Senator Connealy, I bet you \$10 to a doughnut, such and such a thing will occur, but it's not really going to be on me to pay if I lose. Senator Connealy is going to have to go talk to Senator Dwite Pedersen, who doesn't wager at all. That's not the way I wager. And to my way of looking at it, this type of scheme is not in the best interest of the integrity of this bond-issuing process. And I do not see any reason why we have to change the constitution and do what is being offered by this amendment for the Red Cross or any other operation. Some guy was just let out of prison, in Mexico, after staying there eight months because of something the American Red Cross did that was shabby, and he shouldn't have gone to prison there in the first place. The Red Cross was trying to avoid some tariff costs, so they were going to say all this stuff going to Mexico was going to be donated, it was going to the Mexican Red Cross, I believe. Well, when the stuff got there, according to what some of these Red Cross schemers said, the stuff was not usable and it was broken. So the officials in